

Mr. Speaker, if Ecuador is allowed to send its tuna into America duty free, canned tuna will become a foreign-controlled commodity instead of a branded product U.S. consumers have trusted for over 95 years. If Ecuador is allowed to send its tuna into the U.S. duty free, U.S. tuna operations in California, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa will be forced to close. I am talking about American workers losing 10,000 jobs if this industry closes.

Mr. Speaker, I say respectfully shame on Charlie the Tuna. Shame on StarKist. Shame on H.J. Heinz for threatening an American industry in a time of national crisis.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act and Sec. 221(c) of H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocations for the House Committee on Appropriations.

As reported to the House, H.R. 3061, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2002, includes an emergency-designated appropriation providing \$300,000,000 in new budget authority for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Outlays totaling \$75,000,000 are expected to flow from that budget authority in fiscal year 2002. Under the provisions of both the Budget Act and the budget resolution, I must adjust the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates upon the reporting of a bill containing emergency appropriations.

In addition, the bill contains appropriations for continuing disability reviews (CDRs) and adoption assistance payments. The CDR appropriation provides \$433,000,000 in new budget authority and \$381,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2002. The adoption assistance appropriation provides \$20,000,000 in new budget authority and \$3,000,000 in outlays this year. I also must adjust the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates upon the reporting of a bill containing appropriations for those purposes, up to the limits contained in the Budget Act. The amounts provided by the appropriations bill are within those limits.

To reflect these required adjustments, I hereby increase the 302(a) allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$663,499,000,000 for budget authority and \$683,378,000,000 for outlays. The increase in the allocation also requires an increase in the budgetary aggregates to \$1,628,687,000,000 for budget authority and \$1,591,076,000,000 for outlays.

These adjustments apply while the legislation is under consideration and take effect upon final enactment of such legislation. Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski at 67270.

AIRLINE BAGGAGE SCREENING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, several of us have come to the well of the House to address what is the most pressing national issue of the moment that unfortunately the U.S. Congress has not dealt with adequately, and that is the security of our families and our communities.

We just heard the President of the United States talking about the existence of threats in this regard, that it is appropriate to be on high alert for these particular threats. We have come to the House tonight with a message that basically the House needs to act and act quickly on measures designed to enhance our national security in our homeland.

Unfortunately, although we are now a month past this terrible attack, this Chamber has not had a significant vote on bringing a security package for adoption by the U.S. Congress. We are very disappointed by that. We think that the threat is real, that we have the ability to respond to these threats, but to date we have not had the House deal with these issues in a satisfactory fashion. We would like to talk about a few of those issues tonight.

First, an issue that was brought to my attention about a week and a half ago, Americans realize the threat we are under with airlines. We Americans have an expectation, for instance, that the luggage that goes into airlines will be screened for explosive devices. We in America have the technology, fortunately, and this is good news, we have very, very good technology that is available to screen 100 percent of the luggage that goes into the belly of our airplanes.

Unfortunately, that is not happening. In fact, the truth is the vast majority of bags that go into the luggage compartment of jets is not screened, is not screened by X-ray, CAT scan, sniffing, human eye or otherwise. A small percentage is.

□ 2045

Clearly, given the nature of the threat, this Chamber needs to adopt a law that will require 100 percent screening of our baggage that goes into the baggage compartment of airplanes. We do this now fortunately for carry-on baggage and we do it relatively effectively. But we have equipment that will screen very, very effectively for the baggage that goes into our aircraft. We need to make sure those are used with 100 percent of the baggage that goes into the aircraft.

I have introduced the Baggage Screening Act, with others, some of whom are here tonight to address this issue. Unfortunately, we have not had a vote on this. We have had votes on birth control issues, we have had votes

on gay partners' rights, but we have not had a vote on security issues. We have come here tonight to urge the leadership of the House to bring to the floor, amongst others, the Baggage Screening Act so hopefully we can increase the security.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), a cosponsor of the Baggage Screening Act who has been very active in this regard.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I thank my friend from Washington for yielding. I think most Americans believe that when they go to an airport and they check their luggage, that that luggage will be screened for explosives before it is loaded on the plane that they are going to be flying on, with their families perhaps. I thought that was the case until a couple of years ago when one of my constituents, a young woman, went to Jamaica with two friends for a week's vacation. On the way back as they were screening her luggage in Jamaica, they discovered a handgun in that luggage and she was thrown in jail and remained in a Jamaican jail for several days. It cost her family a lot of money for legal help and so on to get her back to this country. As I was discussing this with her, I said, "Why did you take a gun with you to Jamaica?" She said, "I had no idea the gun was in the luggage. I borrowed the luggage from my mother," her mother who had gone on a camping trip the summer before. And I wondered how did this luggage get out of the airport in Columbus, Ohio with a handgun without that being recognized, and that is when I first discovered that luggage is not routinely examined for contraband and weapons and explosives when you check it.

As you know, only about, I think, 5 percent of the luggage is even checked today. The theory has always been, well, if someone checks luggage and then gets on the plane and is a passenger, that they certainly would not have put an explosive on the plane, otherwise they would end up killing themselves. We now know after September 11 that there are people who are willing to kill themselves in order to kill Americans. But even the theory that if you check your luggage and you are getting on the plane that it is not likely to have an explosive does not hold up because we do not even follow that procedure well.

Two weeks ago in Denver, I had some friends who were flying from Denver to Columbus, Ohio, a young man and his wife and a young child. They went to the Denver airport and they checked their luggage, and they waited to get on their plane. As they were waiting to get on the plane, they became increasingly nervous about flying. At the last minute they decided not to fly but to drive to Columbus, Ohio. But their luggage remained on that plane and a relative picked it up in Columbus, Ohio.

So even the procedures that we are supposed to have in place now are not